



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/784,751

02/15/2001

A. Christian Tahan

XWRLD-102

1517

7590
Robert K Tendler
65 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02110

03/30/2009

EXAMINER

MORGAN, ROBERT W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/30/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/784,751	Applicant(s) TAHAN, A. CHRISTIAN	
	Examiner ROBERT W. MORGAN	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2009 and 16 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/16/09 has been entered.

Notice to Applicant

2. This communication is response to the amendment filed 1/16/09 and 3/16/09. Claims 1 and 3-18 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,417 to Schoenberg and U.S. Patent No. 5,822,544 to Chaco et al. in view of US 2002/0004729 to Zak et al.

As per claim 1, Schoenberg teaches a system for assisting in the rapid and secure delivery of medical information directly to the site at which emergency assistance is being performed and which is remote and for uploading information from the remote emergency assistance site relative to the condition of the patient at the remote emergency assistance site, from any hospital

Art Unit: 3626

or emergency room (this recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951)) comprising:

- the claimed global database for warehousing patient history information is met by database (122, Fig. 1);

- the claimed server for transmitting a patient history information file to said site once access has been granted is met by the server system (120, Fig. 1) that determines requestor identification and transmits medical information to the request system (130, Fig. 1) (see: column 5, lines 47 to column 6, lines 35); and

- the claimed computer and display at the site remote from any hospital or emergency room and at which said emergency assistance is being performed, said computer and display being wirelessly connected via a wireless transceiver at said site capable of handling said large size patient history file for displaying said patient history information from information downloaded from said server, said transceiver uploading information about a patient at said remote site to said global database is met by the request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone and is located wherever access to a patient's medical record is required such as in an emergency room, ambulance or another doctor's office

Art Unit: 3626

(see: column 4, lines 36-51). In addition, when a patient's medical record is needed, the requestor inputs to the server system (120, Fig. 1) through request system (130, Fig. 1) and over network (160, Fig. 1) (see: column 5, lines 33-36). Moreover, the Examiner respectfully submits that insofar as claim 1, merely states "capable of handling said large size patient history file...", the prior art need only show a capability of handling said large size patient history file, and not the actual handling, per se.

Schoenberg fails to explicitly teach:

- the claimed access code assigned to a predetermined patient to permit access to the corresponding patient history information;

- the claimed access code carried by said patient; and

- the claimed access code entry device at said computer and display for the entry for the entry of the access code carried by said patient and for transmittal thereof to said global database, thus to permit the downloading of the patient history information upon authorization, whereby critical medical information is available at the site at which medical assistance is being performed.

Chaco et al. teaches a patient care and communication system using a memory card that contains patient identification information such as ID numbers (116, Fig. 1), which used to access patient information from a local or main computer (see: column 7, lines 10-18 and 50-67). In addition, Chaco et al. teaches that the memory card (110, Fig. 1a and 1b) is approximately the same size as a credit card, which can be carried by the patient (see: column 7, lines 10-18). Chaco et al. further teaches that the patient station (210, Fig. 2) includes a memory card

Art Unit: 3626

reader/writer (412, Fig. 4) into which the memory card (110, Fig. 1) may be inserted (see: column 11, 14-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the memory card using ID numbers to access patient information as taught by Chaco et al. within the method and system for distributing medical information as taught by Schoenberg with the motivation of using a system capable of performing task such as maintaining patient medical data to provide maximum patient care (see: Chaco et al.: column 3, lines 8-13).

Schoenberg and Chaco et al. fail to explicitly teach uploading and downloading information to the global database.

Zak et al. teaches an hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information by an emergency medical technician (5, Fig. 1) at the site of the medical emergency (2, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 55). In addition, Zak et al. teaches that all information related to the emergency is retained and electronic transferred to the hospital's computer system. Furthermore, Zak et al. teaches that the system creates SQL to load/update the ODBC-compliant database (see: paragraph 92).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include a hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information as taught by Zak et al. with the system of Schoenberg and Chaco et al. with the motivation of providing EMS personnel with a compact, convenient, durable, and inexpensive device that strongly supports their efforts to provide quality out-of-hospital care (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 36).

Art Unit: 3626

As per claim 3, Schoenberg teaches a wireless transceiver includes a wireless phone having downloading and uploading capability and having a display on which said information is presented. This feature is met the request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone (see: column 4, lines 36-51). The Examiner considers the cellular telephone to have the capability of downloading and uploading information.

As per claim 4, Schoenberg teach the claimed wireless transceiver includes a personal digital assistant. This feature is met the request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone (see: column 4, lines 36-51).

As per claim 5, Schoenberg, and Chaco et al. teach a request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone (see: column 4, lines 36-51).

Schoenberg and Chaco fail to explicitly teach modifying the data in said global database, whereby patient diagnosis and treatment can be uploaded to said global database.

Zak et al. teaches an hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information by an emergency medical technician (5, Fig. 1) at the site of the medical emergency (2, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 55). In addition, the apparatus (10, Fig. 1) includes a basic set of data collection forms such as a problem and treatment form (see: paragraph 57, 60 and 62). In addition, when the patient (2, Fig. 1) is transported to an emergency department (20, Fig. 1), the patient report (15, Fig. 1) is wirelessly transmitted to an emergency department laser printer and the emergency staff (25, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 56). Additionally, Zak et al. teaches that all

Art Unit: 3626

information related to the emergency is retained and electronic transferred to the hospital's computer system. Furthermore, Zak et al. teaches that the system creates SQL to load/update the ODBC-compliant database (see: paragraph 92).

The obviousness of combining the teachings of Zak et al. with the system of Chaco et al. are discussed in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

As per claim 7, Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. teach the claimed access code is in the form of a machine readable code and wherein said access code entry device includes a machine code reader. This feature is met by the patient's bracelet with a bar-coded ID number that is read with a bar-code reader or the portable nurse station bar-coded reader (see: Chaco et al.: column 28, lines 32-37).

As per claim 8, Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. teach the claimed machine readable code is a bar code and wherein said access code entry device includes a bar code reader. This feature is met by the patient's bracelet with a bar-coded ID number that is read with a bar-code reader or the portable nurse station bar-coded reader (see: Chaco et al.: column 28, lines 32-37).

As per claim 9, Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. teach the claimed global database is subdivided into a number of databases, each located in a different geographic region and each having a separate server, with the information from said global database being shared between the subdivided databases and wherein each subdivided database has an associated server, such that rapid transmission of patient information is assured regardless of the location of the patient. This limitation is met by the reference databases for drugs and protocols accessed by the emergency medical technician to support the collection of data (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 19). In

Art Unit: 3626

addition, when a patient's medical record is needed, the requestor inputs to the server system (120, Fig. 1) through request system (130, Fig. 1) and over network (160, Fig. 1) (see: Schoenberg: column 5, lines 33-36). Furthermore, the setup system (110, Fig. 1) can be located at the patient's physician office (see: Schoenberg: column 4, lines 46-48).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,417 to Schoenberg, U.S. Patent No. 5,822,544 to Chaco et al. and US 2002/0004729 to Zak et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,992,890 to Simcox.

As per claim 6, Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. teach an hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information by an emergency medical technician (5, Fig. 1) at the site of the medical emergency (2, Fig. 1) (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 55).

Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. fail to explicitly teach transmitting said prescription to a pharmacy for filling.

Simcox teaches a hand held remote computer including means for electronically communicating to a host computer which facilitates verification of the data entry and icon selection and provides for electronic communication with a remote pharmaceutical distribution point (see: column 2, lines 37-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the hand held computer that provides electronic communication with a remote pharmaceutical distribution point as taught by Simcox with the system as taught by Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. with the motivation of providing a prescription media which includes a plurality of visual indicia to give positive correlation

Art Unit: 3626

between a prescribed pharmaceutical and the application of that pharmaceutical (see: column 2, lines 5-9).

5. Claims 10-11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,417 to Schoenberg in view of US 2002/0004729 to Zak et al.

As per claim 10, Schoenberg teaches a method of providing patient histories to a site remote from any hospital or emergency room and at the location of a patient in need of medical attention, comprising the steps of:

--the claimed providing patient histories at a centralized location in a global database coupled to the Internet by a server is met by the setup system having a computer processor and associated memory for inputting the medical information to the database (see: column 3, lines 41-44). In addition, the system (100, Fig. 1) includes a setup system (110, Fig. 1), server system (120, Fig. 1) and request system (130, Fig. 1) all connected to a common communications (see: column 4, lines 15-17). In addition, Schoenberg teaches a request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone and is located wherever access to a patient's medical record is required such as in an emergency room, ambulance or another doctor's office (see: column 4, lines 36-51).

Schoenberg fails to explicitly teach the claimed uploading patient information from said site.

Zak et al. teaches an hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information by an emergency medical technician (5, Fig. 1) at the site of the medical emergency (2, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 55). In addition, the apparatus (10, Fig. 1) includes a basic set of data

Art Unit: 3626

collection forms such as a problem and treatment form (see: paragraph 57, 60 and 62).

Additionally, when a patient (2, Fig. 1) is transported to an emergency department (20, Fig. 1), the patient report (15, Fig. 1) is wirelessly transmitted to an emergency department laser printer and the emergency staff (25, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 56).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include a hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for uploading patient information from the site of the accident as taught by Zak et al. within the method and system for distributing medical information as taught by Schoenberg with the motivation of providing EMS personnel with a compact, convenient, durable, and inexpensive device that strongly supports their efforts to provide quality out-of-hospital care (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 36).

As per claim 11, Schoenberg teach the claimed patient history is only transmitted when authorized by the patient. This feature is met by the user that can be a patient or the patient's physician generates security access codes at step 202 to provide varying access to the patient's medical records (see: column 4, lines 54-57). In addition, Schoenberg teaches a server system (120, Fig. 1) that determines requestor identification and transmits medical information to the request system (130, Fig. 1) (see: column 5, lines 47 to column 6, lines 35).

As per claim 18, Schoenberg, and Zak et al. teach the claimed global database is decentralized through the use of regional databases, each having its own server and each carrying patient histories so that access to the patient history can be on a real time basis to permit timely treatment. This limitation is met by the reference databases for drugs and protocols accessed by the emergency medical technician to support the collection of data (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 19). In addition, when a patient's medical record is needed, the requestor inputs to the server

Art Unit: 3626

system (120, Fig. 1) through request system (130, Fig. 1) and over network (160, Fig. 1) (see: Schoenberg: column 5, lines 33-36). In addition, Schoenberg, and Zak et al. teaches a server system (120, Fig. 1) that determines requestor identification and transmits medical information to the request system (130, Fig. 1) (see: Schoenberg: column 5, lines 47 to column 6, lines 35). The Examiner considers that once the server identifies the requestor information then the medical information is transmitted in real time.

6. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,417 to Schoenberg and US 2002/0004729 to Zak et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,544 to Chaco et al.

As per claim 12, Schoenberg and Zak et al. fail to teach the claimed authorization is in the form of an access code carried by the patient.

Chaco et al. teaches a memory card that contains patient identification information such as ID numbers (116, Fig. 1), which used to access patient information from a local or main computer (see: column 7, lines 10-18 and 50-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the memory card using ID numbers to access patient information as taught by Chaco et al. with the system as taught by Schoenberg and Zak et al. with the motivation of using a system capable of performing task such as maintaining patient medical data to provide maximum patient care (see: Chaco et al.: column 3, lines 8-13).

As per claim 13, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is obtained from the patient and is transmitted to the server associated with said global database. This feature is met by the user that can be a patient or the patient's physician generates security

Art Unit: 3626

access codes at step 202 to provide varying access to the patient's medical records (see: Schoenberg: column 4, lines 54-57). In addition, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teaches a server system (120, Fig. 1) that determines requestor identification and transmits medical information to the request system (130, Fig. 1) (see: Schoenberg: column 5, lines 47 to column 6, lines 35). Additionally, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach a memory card that contains patient identification information such as ID numbers (116, Fig. 1), which used to access patient information from a local or main computer (see: Chaco et al.: column 7, lines 10-18 and 50-67).

As per claim 14, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is carried by the patient. This limitation is met by the memory card (110, Fig. 1a and 1b) is approximately the same size as a credit card, which can be carried by the patient (see: Chaco et al.: column 7, lines 10-18).

As per claim 15, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is in the form of a bar code and wherein a bar code reader is used to read the access code and transmit the access code to the server associated with said global database. This limitation is met by the patient's bracelet with a bar-coded ID number that is read with a bar-code reader or the portable nurse station bar-coded reader (see: Chaco et al.: column 28, lines 32-37).

As per claim 16, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is carried on a bracelet. This feature is met by the patient's bracelet with a bar-coded ID number that is read with a bar-code reader or the portable nurse station bar-coded reader (see: Chaco et al.: column 28, lines 32-37).

Art Unit: 3626

As per claim 17, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is imprinted on a card adapted to be carried. This limitation is met by the memory card (110, Fig. 1) that includes printed ID numbers on the front (see: Chaco et al.: column 7, lines 10-18).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/16/09 and 3/16/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed herein below in the order in which they appear in the response filed 1/16/09 and 3/16/09.

In response the Applicant's Affidavits, Appendices and argument that the invention was both conceived and reduced to practice prior to February 22, 2000 with the reduction-to-practice documented by and photographs of screens shots showing an actual patient record and the running of code on the inventor's computer. The Examiner respectfully submits that according the MPEP 2138.05 "In an interference proceeding, a party seeking to establish an actual reduction to practice must satisfy a two-prong test: (1) **the party constructed an embodiment or performed a process that met every element of the interference count**, and (2) the embodiment or process operated for its intended purpose." *Eaton v. Evans*, 204 F.3d 1094, 1097, 53 USPQ2d 1696, 1698 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Therefore, the Applicant has not mapped out the nexus between the claim language and screen shots photos and C++ code in the many Appendices provided. Furthermore, according MPEP section 715.07, there are additional cases pertaining to the requirements necessary to establish actual reduction to practice see *DSL Dynamic Sciences, Ltd. v. Union Switch & Signal, Inc.*, 928 F.2d 1122, 1126, 18 USPQ2d 1152, 1155 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ("events occurring after an alleged actual reduction to practice can call into question whether reduction to practice has in fact occurred"); ** *Fitzgerald v. Arbib*, 268 F.2d 763, 765-

Art Unit: 3626

66, 122 USPQ 530, 531-32 (CCPA 1959) ("the reduction to practice of a three-dimensional design invention requires the production of an article embodying that design" in "other than a mere drawing")>; *Birmingham v. Randall*, 171 F.2d 957, 80 USPQ 371, 372 (CCPA 1948) (To establish an actual reduction to practice of an invention directed to a method of making a product, it is not enough to show that the method was performed. "[S]uch an invention is not reduced to practice until it is established that the product made by the process is satisfactory, and [] this may require successful testing of the product."). The Applicant has also not provided the nexus mapping out what has been claimed with screen shots photos and therefore, it's the Examiner's position that the Schoenberg and Zak references are maintained as prior art.

Conclusion

This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/784751. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however,

Art Unit: 3626

event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT W. MORGAN whose telephone number is (571)272-6773. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m. Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, C. Luke Gilligan can be reached on (571) 272-6770. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert Morgan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626